

REMARKS

This is in reply to the Office Action mailed July 6, 2007. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application. Claims 1-21 and 26-29 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

In the Action, claims 1-21 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,704,024 (Robotham et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method of providing content to a target device. Claim 1 recites, in part, "identifying a device class associated with the target device" and "compiling an application based on a page file including information describing the content to be returned to the target device." The information includes "statements of device class-specific user interface display properties for the content to be returned," and the device class-specific user interface display properties are "based on the device class of the target device."

Robotham et al. discloses a method of displaying visual content on a client device using server-side rasterization of visual content. Visual content is rendered on a server system, transformed into bitmaps compatible with the display attributes of a client device, and transmitted for display on the client device. The client and server coordinate to perform as a remote, multi-level browsing system that can display Web pages, e-mail, electronic documents, images, etc. at the client device. The approach is remote because the server does the rendering and the client provides the interface. The approach is multi-level because both the client and server share data about the visual content element. The image is rasterized on the server side into a form compatible with the client display.

Robotham et al. does not disclose "compiling an application based on a page file" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In Robotham et al., a visual content element is converted into a bitmap representation by the process of rasterizing. Rasterizing refers to a process that uses "transcoding, rendering and/or pixel transforms." Robotham et al., column 4, lines 27-29. Transcoding refers to source-to-source transforms. Rendering refers to generating displayable data from source data, i.e. performing a source-raster conversion by some type of

interpretation or conversion. Pixel transformation refers to raster-to-raster transforms. (Robotham et al. column 4, lines 15-21). Rasterizing (i.e., converting a visual content element into a bitmap) as described in Robotham et al. does not constitute "compiling" as recited by claim 1 of the present application.

In the present application, compiling is described as converting a class into an object. For example, a control hierarchy such as an object class that defines the executable portion of a server-based application is compiled from a page file into a server-based application. See page 11, lines 16-20 of the present application. The section of Robotham et al. identified in the Action with reference to compiling (24:65 - 25:10) does not disclose compiling. Instead, this section of Robotham simply discloses rendering of visual content. Therefore, it is submitted that Robotham et al. does not disclose "compiling an application based on a page file," as recited in claim 1.

Robotham et al. also does not disclose a page file containing statements of device-specific user interface display properties" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. For example, in the present application, a page file includes a set of tags corresponding to server controls that govern the information presented to the target device. The page file includes instructions that define which server objects are used and also includes additional declarative statements that may set the properties of those server objects. See page 7, lines 23-29. By contrast, Robotham et al. discloses that a visual content element is located on a file system (column 25, lines 11-12) and that a source descriptor data element provides information about the visual content element (column 25, lines 9-10) but it does not disclose a page file containing "statements of device-specific user interface display properties" as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Therefore, it submitted that Robotham et al. does not disclose all the elements of claim 1 of the present application. Since claims 2-12 and 26-29 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is also submitted that claims 2-12 and 26-29 are also in allowable form.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium having computer readable instructions. Claim 13 recites, in part, "determining whether a compiled version of the page exists for the target device" and "compiling the page to create a class based on a file including values for device-specific content, the class associated with the display properties."

Robotham et al. does not disclose "determining whether a compiled version of the page exists for the target device" and "compiling the page to create a class based on a file including values for device-specific content, the class associated with the display properties" as recited in claim 13 of the present application. This is because Robotham et al. fails to disclose a method that uses compiling, as discussed above. Claim 13 is therefore allowable.

Since claims 14-21 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 13, it is submitted that claims 13-21 are also in allowable form.

Conclusion

Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Additionally, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees as set forth in §§ 38 CFR 1.16 to 1.18 which may be required for entry of these papers or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: January 7, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471

RAK/BPR